



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 1995

No. 106

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. EMERSON].

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 27, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable BILL EMERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leaders limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] for 5 minutes.

### WHAT NEW BUDGET FROM THE PRESIDENT?

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, as our colleagues are aware, the House and Senate budget committees reached a resolution of the differences between the House budget resolution and the budget resolution of the other body, and we may get their conference report on the future budget as soon as this week, and I want to say that they have had to make a number of hard choices, just as each body, the House and the other body, had to make hard choices within their own budget resolutions.

Nevertheless, I have noticed a great deal of media discussion again comparing the President's new budget that he talked about in his televised presentation to the Nation a couple of weeks ago with the proposed united congressional budget, and by united congressional budget, I mean the House-Senate conference report which is coming to us.

Now, I have to say with the utmost respect: "What new budget from the President of the United States?"

Now, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, this is a budget. In fact, this is the President's budget submitted to the Congress in February of this year, which, as you can see by its size, goes through each agency and each program and point by point proposes spending in the next fiscal year and beyond. There is no such document from the White House, at least as of this time, which gives comparable point-by-point proposals for spending.

There is, if one contacts the White House, available some talking points about the President's new budget goals. But talking points are not by themselves a budget. A budget is program-by-program recommendations on spending.

The fact of the matter is in most respects we do not know what is in the President's new budget and, therefore, when the media compares the President's budget with the congressional budget, they are comparing our real budget with the President's talking points, and, as such, there cannot be a point-by-point comparison.

We do not know how the President's new budget will affect so many programs that are federally funded. We have a brief reference in the President's televised address to the Nation referring to a 20-percent cut in funding for discretionary programs except for the military and except for education, and the President stated he wanted to boost spending on education. But what

does that 20-percent cut mean? First of all, is it a 20-percent real cut? Did the President mean that Federal agencies will have 20 percent less budget or did he mean it will be a Washington cut, there will be a 20 percent decrease in the amount of new spending? I think that is a reasonable question, but there is no answer to it.

Further, does that mean a 20-percent cut across the board? That means, however you define a cut, will every single agency except for the military and except for the agency, have a 20 percent reduced budget, or does it mean an average 20 percent reduction so that some agencies and some programs will, say, remain the same and other agencies and programs will be reduced by 40 percent? We do not know any of that either.

So, to give some specific examples, we do not know what the congressional proposal is being compared to. Let me give three examples very briefly. First of all, to start with, my home State of New Mexico, there has been a great deal of discussion about how the future funding of the Federal Government will affect the two national laboratories in New Mexico and there has been a good deal of debate about what the congressional figures will mean in various programs. I want to say that all of this is fair commentary, that the national laboratories, I think, are important programs, but they understand, as everyone understands, that they will be affected as all Federal programs will, in the goal to reach the balanced budget. But the evaluation of how they are being treated by Congress cannot be made in a vacuum.

How will all the national laboratories fare in the President's new budget if the President's new budget is adopted as the spending blueprint for the Congress? Well, we just do not know because we have not seen those figures. Nobody thus far can answer that question.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H6313

Just this morning, just to show this applies anywhere, as I was leaving my apartment to come here, I saw one of the national morning news programs. They were centered around the national park system, and one of the comments I heard is they said we will be talking about how proposed congressional cuts will affect the National Park Service.

I just wanted to say, to be a full player, Mr. Speaker, the President has to provide a full proposed budget.

#### COMPACT-IMPACT AID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again call attention to the problem of unrestricted immigration to Guam allowed by the compact of free association and the failure of the Federal Government to fulfill its promises to Guam to reimburse our local government for the cost of educational and social services that this immigration policy causes.

This legal immigration allows the citizens of the three nations of the former trust territory to travel unrestricted to the United States, without passports or visas, and to reside, work, or attend school without going through the usual INS applications. In opening the door to this unusual and generous policy, the Federal Government also promised in Public Law 99-239 to reimburse the American islands in the Pacific for the expected costs. Guam, because of its proximity, has received the greatest share of this immigration.

Since 1985, when the compact was enacted, and compact-impact aid was authorized, Guam has incurred over \$70 million in costs. Guam has received a grand total of \$2.5 million in reimbursement.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has spoken out loud and clear on unfunded Federal mandates. As we consider the Interior appropriations bill this week, I urge my colleagues to ensure that the funding for Guam's reimbursement is included. Let us make sure that on this issue, promises are kept.

#### THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Federal budget and to talk about the context in which it is being discussed both by the President and in the media and on the floor, and I particularly want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from New Mexico who spoke before me in his remarks regarding highlighting what the fundamental problems are in the way that we talk about the budget itself.

Let me just share a couple of numbers with you that may be helpful. Total spending for 1995 was \$1,531 trillion; that is, \$1,531 trillion. The projected spending for the year 2000, under the Republican conference bill that was just approved by the conference committee, will be \$1,778 trillion, that is, \$1,778 trillion. Let us go over those again:

In 1995, \$1,531,000,000,000, in 2000, \$1,778,000,000,000: More than \$350 billion more will be spent in the year 2000 by the Federal Government under the Republican plan that gets us to a balanced budget than was spent or is being spent right now in the fiscal year 1995.

Now, let me put that in the context of something that the President said on the CBS This Morning program about 2 years ago, May 27, 1993. He was being interviewed by Paula Zahn, and he said in response to a question about the budget he said, "We have about \$100 billion in cuts, but they are still going up very rapidly." I will say that again: "We have about \$100 billion in cuts in various entitlement programs, but they are still going up very rapidly."

Now, what does that mean? Think about those words. How can we have \$100 billion in cuts but they are still going up very rapidly? That is the problem with Washington doublespeak. We talk a lot about Orwellian language. We talk a lot about the problem that George Orwell so brilliantly talked about and exposed there is his novel "1984," and it is the problem of the debasement of language, the abuse of language and the use of language in a way that, in fact, confuses people instead of bringing clarity and light, and that is the problem we have got with the budget, because the reality is that we talk about money inside Washington in a way that is very different from how we talk about it over kitchen tables in Cleveland, OH, or over corporate board tables in corporate boardrooms or the way that people in churches discuss their budget for the next year or the way that people with nonprofit foundations and corporations and universities and institutions of that sort discuss their budget. The fact is that we can talk about money in Washington in terms of a projected amount of growth that was created by a bureaucratic agency known as the Congressional Budget Office, and that budget office, the CBO, talks about we are going to have this much growth projected; therefore, if you project spending less than that, that is a cut, and if you project spending the same as that, then you have not spent more money, but the reality is that in Cleveland, OH, if you are going to spend \$5,000 on food and clothing in 1996 and you spent \$4,700 on food and clothing for your family in 1995, that is a \$300 or 6 or 7 percent increase in spending. It is not a cut. It cannot be a cut under any circumstances, and until and unless we begin to use language in Washington

the same way that we use language in the rest of the country, the public is going to continue to be confused about this.

Let us look at Medicare as an example, because this is where you will hear the greatest exploitation of these projected increases in terms of political exploitation, and these numbers will be used to inject fear into the debate, to scare senior citizens and, frankly, to confuse for political gain. The reality is that in 1995 we are spending \$178 billion on Medicare. In the year 2000, under the Republican budget plan, if that is what is finally approved and passed by both the Senate and the House and then signed into law this coming August or September by the President of the United States, we will spend \$214 billion, \$178 billion in Medicare in 1995, \$214 billion on Medicare in the year 2000.

Does that or does that not sound like an increase? Clearly, it is an increase, and yet you will hear it described as a cut.

#### ELECTIONS IN HAITI

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, speaking of the budget as the previous colleagues have from this point of view, I think it is important to note that today the Members of this body will be discussing the appropriation for our foreign operations assistance, and that, of course, is part of our budget process, how much money are we going to parcel out for the different things we undertake as the United States of America through the governance in Washington.

Today I am here to talk a little bit about a specific budget item and a little bit about a situation where American taxpayers' dollars go in very substantial amounts, because I think there is some interest in it. I think there should be some interest in it.

I am reporting about the situation in Haiti today, discussing a little bit the question about foreign aid for Haiti, how much is right and how should we handle it.

As we go through the foreign operations appropriations bill, I will be submitting an amendment that will deal directly with the subject, so in a way I am going to use these few moments just to say that I have come back from the elections in Haiti, and I think that there is a very important message in those elections, and I also feel that there is much work ahead and much accountability ahead.

Let me be specific. The headline this morning in one of the Washington papers was, "A step for Democracy?" After reviewing showing pictures and reviewing the reports that are coming from Haiti, I would conclude, having been there for 4 days and gotten around part of the country and been in charge